May 20, 2005 Edge v. Norfolk Financial Corporation — 04-12134

Hourly Billings for Yvonne W. Rosmarin

Hourly Rate - \$325.00 Travel @ ½ Hourly Rate

Date	Description	Time Spent	Billable
2/13/04	Assess documents received from client	0.60	195.00
2/26/04	Telephone conference with client concerning lawsuit against Norfolk	0.20	65.00
6/28/04	Draft letter to Secretary of State requesting corporate information on Norfolk	0.20	65.00
9/15/04	Assess additional collection letters for claims	0.20	65.00
9/15/04	Draft complaint	0.60	195.00
9/16/04	Telephone conference with client concerning information needed for drafting complaint	0.10	32.50
9/23/04	Telephone call to client returning her call left message on voice mail	0.10	No Charge
10/4/04	Continue draft of complaint; revise	0.40	130.00
10/4/04	Research on internet for current licensing of Norfolk Financial as a debt collector with Massachusetts Division of Banks	0.10	No Charge
10/5/04	Edit, revise and proof complaint	0.50	162.50
10/7/04	Telephone conference with client concerning L.R. 16.1(D)(3) certification	0.10	32.50
10/7/04	Draft L.R. 16.1(D)(3) certification for emailing to client	0.10	32.50
11/8/04	Telephone conference with sheriff's office concerning improper service on Goldstone and need to serve him properly	0.10	32.50
11/8/04	Draft letter to deputy sheriff's office requesting they re-serve summons and complaint they previously served improperly on Goldstone	0.20	65.00
11/22/04	Draft letter to court to file returns of service	0.10	No Charge
11/29/04	Read and assess defendant's motion to dismiss / motion for summary judgment; make notes	0.80	260.00
11/29/04	Research on Rooker-Feldman doctrine for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss	0.90	292.50
11/30/04	Telephone call to client concerning defendant's motion to dismiss left message on voice mail	0.10	No Charge
11/30/04	Research on Rooker-Feldman doctrine	1.30	422.50

for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/1/04 Telephone calls to client concerning defendant's motion to dismiss left messages on voice mail 12/1/04 Telephone conference with client concerning details of what occurred on 1/8/04 when the small claims court case was set for trial 12/2/04 Research on preclusion and judicial setoppel issues raised in defendants' motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Telephone conference with client concerning her recollection of events in small claims court on 1/8/04 to compare with defendants' facts 12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor concerning request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss to request for additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 Preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 Preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes			Time	
motion to dismiss 12/1/04 Telephone calls to client concerning defendant's motion to dismiss left messages on voice mail 12/1/04 Telephone conference with client concerning details of what occurred on 1/8/04 when the small claims court case was set for trial 12/2/04 Research on issue and claim perclusion. Judicial estoppel issues raised in defendants' motion to dismiss 12/2/14 Telephone conference with client concerning her recollection of events in small claims court on 1/8/04 to compare with defendants' facts 12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor concerning request for additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Port motion to extend time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issues raised in defendant's opposition; make notes	<u>Date</u>	Description	Spent	Billable
motion to dismiss 12/1/04 Telephone calls to client concerning defendant's motion to dismiss left messages on voice mail 12/1/04 Telephone conference with client concerning details of what occurred on 1/8/04 when the small claims court case was set for trial 12/2/04 Research on issue and claim perclusion. Judicial estoppel issues raised in defendants' motion to dismiss 12/2/14 Telephone conference with client concerning her recollection of events in small claims court on 1/8/04 to compare with defendants' facts 12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor concerning request for additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Port motion to extend time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issues raised in defendant's opposition; make notes		for opposition to defendant's		
12/1/04 Telephone calls to client concerning defendant's motion to dismiss left messages on voice mail 12/1/04 Telephone conference with client concerning details of what occurred on 1/8/04 when the small claims court case was set for trial 12/2/04 Research on preclusion and judicial estoppel issues raised in defendants' motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Telephone conference with client concerning her recollection of events in small claims court on 1/8/04 to compare with defendants' facts 12/2/04 Telephone conference with client concerning her recollection of events in small claims court on 1/8/04 to compare with defendants' facts 12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor concerning request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendant's motion to dismiss not on the plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes				
concerning defendant's motion to dismiss left messages on voice mail 12/1/04 Telephone conference with client concerning details of what occurred on 1/8/04 when the small claims court case was set for trial 12/2/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Telephone conference with client 0.40 130.00 concerning her recollection of events in small claims court on 1/8/04 to compare with defendants' facts 12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor 0.10 No Charge concerning request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss motion to dismiss - spoke with his secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Telephone conference with Atty O'Connor concerning request for opposition 0.20 65.00 to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendant's motion to dismiss case in response to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes	12/1/04		0.10	No Charge
mail 12/1/04 Telephone conference with client concerning details of what occurred on 1/8/04 when the small claims court case was set for trial 12/2/04 Research on preclusion and judicial estoppel issues raised in defendants' motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Telephone conference with client concerning her recollection of events in small claims court on 1/8/04 to compare with defendants' facts 12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor concerning request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss spoke with his secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty O'Connor concerning request for additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue raised in 1.50 487.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition, make notes				3
12/1/04 Telephone conference with client concerning details of what occurred on 1/8/04 when the small claims court case was set for trial 12/2/04 Research on preclusion and judicial estoppel issues raised in defendants' motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Telephone conference with client concerning her recollection of events in small claims court on 1/8/04 to compare with defendants' facts 12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor concerning request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Telephone conference with Atty O'Connor concerning request for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue raised in defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition' make notes		dismiss left messages on voice		
concerning details of what occurred on 1/8/04 when the small claims court case was set for trial 12/2/04 Research on preclusion and judicial 1.80 585.00 estoppel issues raised in defendants' motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Telephone conference with client concerning her recollection of events in small claims court on 1/8/04 to compare with defendants' facts 12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor concerning request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss spoke with his secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman 1.90 617.50 respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/7/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss		mail		
on 1/8/04 when the small claims court case was set for trial 12/2/04 Research on preclusion and judicial 1.80 585.00 estoppel issues raised in defendants' motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Telephone conference with client concerning her recollection of events in small claims court on 1/8/04 to compare with defendants' facts 12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor concerning request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss spoke with his secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendant's motion 12/3/04 Province of the strength of the time to respond to defendant's motion 12/3/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes	12/1/04	Telephone conference with client	0.60	195.00
court case was set for trial 12/2/04 Research on preclusion and judicial estoppel issues raised in defendants' motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Telephone conference with client concerning her recollection of events in small claims court on 1/8/04 to compare with defendants' facts 12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor concerning request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss spoke with his secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in responds to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to one spond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/7/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 Preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 Preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes		concerning details of what occurred		
12/2/04 Research on preclusion and judicial estoppel issues raised in defendants' motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Telephone conference with client concerning her recollection of events in small claims court on 1/8/04 to compare with defendants' facts 12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor concerning request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss spoke with his secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss to defendant's notion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's request for additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendants' motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in respond to defendants' motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Praft motion to extend time to 0.30 97.50 respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismis		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
estoppel issues raised in defendants' motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Telephone conference with client concerning her recollection of events in small claims court on 1/8/04 to compare with defendants' facts 12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor concerning request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss spoke with his secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/7/04 Research on Rooker-Peldman doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issues raised in defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes				
defendants' motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Telephone conference with client concerning her recollection of events in small claims court on 1/8/04 to compare with defendants' facts 12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor concerning request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss — spoke with his secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty O.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/7/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes	12/2/04		1.80	585.00
12/2/04 Telephone conference with client concerning her recollection of events in small claims court on 1/8/04 to compare with defendants' facts 12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor concerning request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss spoke with his secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Past motion to extend time to respond to defendant's motion 12/3/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issues raised in defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes				
concerning her recollection of events in small claims court on 1/8/04 to compare with defendants' facts 12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor concerning request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss spoke with his secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to respond to defendant's motion 12/3/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 1.50 487.50 487.50 487.50 487.50 487.50 487.50 487.50 487.50 487.50 487.50 488.60 688.60 699.61 69	10/0/04		0.40	120.00
events in small claims court on 1/8/04 to compare with defendants' facts 12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor 0.10 No Charge concerning request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss spoke with his secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/7/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman 1.90 617.50 doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss	12/2/04		0.40	130.00
1/8/04 to compare with defendants' facts 12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor concerning request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss spoke with his secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to 0.30 97.50 respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/7/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman 1.90 617.50 doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss				
facts 12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor concerning request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss spoke with his secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to respond to defendant's motion 12/3/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman 1.90 617.50 doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss				
12/2/04 Telephone call to Atty O'Connor concerning request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss spoke with his secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendant's motion 12/3/04 Pasearch on Rooker-Feldman doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 Preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 Preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 Preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss				
concerning request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss spoke with his secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendant's motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to 0.30 97.50 respond to defendant's motion 12/3/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman 1.90 617.50 doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss	12/2/04		0.10	No Charge
time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss spoke with his secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to 0.30 97.50 respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/7/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman 1.90 617.50 doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss				3
secretary regarding additional time to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to 0.30 97.50 respond to defendant's motion 12/3/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman 1.90 617.50 doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss				
to respond to motion to dismiss 12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to 0.30 97.50 respond to defendant's motion 12/3/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman 1.90 617.50 dotrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes		motion to dismiss spoke with his		
12/2/04 Make notes of ideas for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to respond to defendant's motion 12/3/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman 1.90 617.50 doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in defendant's motion to dismiss 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes		secretary regarding additional time		
to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty 0.10 No Charge O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/7/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman 1.90 617.50 doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes		to respond to motion to dismiss		
12/3/04 Telephone conference with Atty O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/7/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes	12/2/04	Make notes of ideas for opposition	0.20	65.00
O'Connor concerning plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to 0.30 97.50 respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/7/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman 1.90 617.50 doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes				
request for additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to 0.30 97.50 respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/7/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman 1.90 617.50 doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes	12/3/04		0.10	No Charge
respond to defendant's motion to dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to 0.30 97.50 respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/7/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman 1.90 617.50 doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes				
dismiss and O'Connor's suggestion that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to 0.30 97.50 respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/7/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman 1.90 617.50 doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes				
that plaintiff just dismiss case in response to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to 0.30 97.50 respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/7/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman 1.90 617.50 doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes				
response to defendants' motion 12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to 0.30 97.50 respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/7/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman 1.90 617.50 doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes				
12/3/04 Draft motion to extend time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/7/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes		-		
respond to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/7/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman 1.90 617.50 doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes	12/3/04		0.30	97.50
dismiss 12/7/04 Research on Rooker-Feldman 1.90 617.50 doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes				
doctrine, issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes				
preclusion, judicial estoppel for opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes	12/7/04	Research on Rooker-Feldman	1.90	617.50
opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes				
dismiss 12/8/04 Research on issue and claim 1.30 422.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes				
12/8/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes				
preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes	10/0/04		1 20	100 50
response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes	12/8/04		1.30	422.50
dismiss 12/9/04 Research on issue and claim 1.50 487.50 preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes				
12/9/04 Research on issue and claim preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes		-		
preclusion, judicial estoppel for response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes	12/9/04		1 50	487 50
response to defendant's motion to dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes	12/3/01		1.30	107.30
dismiss 12/10/04 Research on issues raised in 1.90 617.50 defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes				
<pre>defendant's motion to dismiss for plaintiff's opposition; make notes</pre>		-		
plaintiff's opposition; make notes	12/10/04	Research on issues raised in	1.90	617.50
		defendant's motion to dismiss for		
12/10/04 Telephone conference with Boston 0 30 97 50				
12, 20, 01 1316phone conference with bobton 0.30 77.30	12/10/04	Telephone conference with Boston	0.30	97.50

Doto	Description	Time Spent	Billable
<u>Date</u>	Description	Spent	Dinable
	Municipal Court ass't clerk		
	magistrate concerning small claims		
	court procedures relating to		
	defendants' arguments in their		
	motion to dismiss / summary judgment		
12/13/04	Telephone conference with client	0.10	32.50
	concerning factual details of		
	contents of defendants' affidavit		
	attached to their motion to dismiss		
12/13/04	Research on judicial estoppel and	1.20	390.00
	issue and claim preclusion for		
	opposition to defendant's motion to		
	dismiss; make notes		
12/14/04	Assess holdings and facts in cases	2.90	942.50
	researched for opposition to		
	defendant's motion to dismiss;		
	assess defendants' arguments in		
	light of case holdings and compare		
	factual situations		
12/15/04	Research on FDCPA issues regarding	1.40	455.00
	disclosure of balances in		
	collection letters for opposition		
10/15/04	to defendant's motion to dismiss	0.60	105.00
12/15/04	Outline responses to defendants'	0.60	195.00
10/16/04	arguments in motion to dismiss	1 00	C17 F0
12/16/04	Continue outline of responses to	1.90	617.50
	defendants' arguments in motion to dismiss		
12/17/04	Assess facts as stated in	0.70	227.50
12/1//04	Defendants' affidavits and	0.70	227.50
	statement of undisputed facts		
12/17/04	Telephone call to client concerning	0.10	No Charge
12/1//04	factual details in Defendant's	0.10	No charge
	motion to dismiss / for summary		
	judgment left message on voice		
	mail		
12/17/04	Draft factual background for	1.40	455.00
, , ,	opposition to Defendant's motion to		
	dismiss / for summary judgment		
12/18/04	Calculate rate by which balances in	1.90	617.50
	collection letters increase;		
	prepare table of changes in		
	balances for plaintiff's		
	opposition; draft opposition to		
	defendants' motion to dismiss / for		
	summary judgment		
12/19/04	Draft opposition to Defendant's	0.60	195.00
	motion to dismiss / for summary		
	judgment		
12/20/04	Telephone conference with client	0.20	65.00
	concerning facts in Defendants'		
	affidavits, her memory of what		

Data	Description	Time Spent	Billable
<u>Date</u>	Description	Spent	Dillable
12/20/04	occurred Assess defendants' statement of unopposed facts; draft plaintiff's R. 56.1 statement of material facts; continue draft of opposition	3.10	1007.50
12/21/04	to Defendant's motion to dismiss / for summary judgment Draft R. 56(f) affidavit of Atty Rosmarin; draft opposition to Defendant's motion to dismiss / for summary judgment; edit and revise	2.90	942.50
	Draft plaintiff's affidavit Telephone conference with client concerning her affidavit	0.60 0.20	195.00 65.00
12/22/04	Edit and revise opposition to Defendant's motion to dismiss / for summary judgment; proof	1.90	617.50
12/22/04	Telephone conference with Atty O'Connor concerning request for defendants' assent to motion to file Plaintiff's opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss one day late due to illness	0.10	No Charge
1/11/05	Telephone call from Atty O'Connor concerning his proposal to settle federal case for cancellation of debt (without payment of attorney's fees or costs)	0.10	32.50
1/11/05	Telephone call to client concerning conference with Atty O'Connor concerning his proposal to settle federal case left message on voice mail	0.10	No Charge
1/12/05	Telephone conference with client concerning settlement offer from Atty O'Connor, probabilities of success on motion to dismiss in federal court	0.20	65.00
1/28/05	Assess requirements of order on scheduling conference received today and determine deadline dates for steps prior to Scheduling Conference	0.10	32.50
1/28/05	Assess appropriate amount to recommend to client as a L.R. 16.1(C) settlement offer as required by scheduling order	0.50	162.50
1/28/05	Draft message to Atty O'Connor asking whether Defendants' answer has actually ever been filed	0.10	No Charge
1/31/05	Draft letter with settlement offer; proof; revise	0.50	162.50
2/2/05	Telephone conference with Atty	0.10	32.50

Doto	Description	Time	Dillabla
<u>Date</u>	Description	Spent	Billable
	O'Connor concerning Scheduling Conference		
2/2/05	Telephone call to judge's clerk, Richard Nici, concerning	0.10	No Charge
	rescheduling Scheduling Conference due to surgery left message on		
0.44.0=	voice mail		
2/4/05	Telephone conference with judge's clerk, Michelle Rynne, concerning rescheduling Scheduling Conference	0.10	32.50
2/4/05	Telephone discussion with Atty	0.10	No Charge
	O'Connor's secretary concerning new date for Scheduling Conference,		J
	assented to motion to change the		
2/4/05	date Draft motion to reset Initial	0.30	97.50
2/4/05	Scheduling Conference; convert to	0.30	97.50
	PDF for electornic filing; draft		
	message for sending draft motion to		
	Atty O'Connor for approval before		
3/16/05	filing Assess whether any of plaintiff's	0.20	65.00
3/10/03	additional documents should be	0.20	03.00
	included in her Initial Disclosures		
3/16/05	Telephone conference with Atty	0.10	32.50
	O'Connor concerning terms for parties' joint statement for		
	Scheduling Conference		
3/16/05	Draft parties' joint statement for	0.20	65.00
	Scheduling Conference		
3/16/05	Draft plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	0.40	130.00
3/16/05	Telephone call to client concerning	0.10	No Charge
	cost information needed for Initial Disclosures		
3/16/05	Draft message to Atty O'Connor to	0.10	No Charge
	send with draft of Joint Statement		J
3/21/05	Telephone call to Atty O'Connor	0.10	No Charge
	concerning his email requesting additional language be put into		
	Joint Statement left message on		
	voice mail		
3/21/05	Telephone conference with Atty	0.10	32.50
	O'Connor concerning provision in		
	Joint Statement regarding discovery		
3/21/05	period Revise Joint Statement to comply	0.10	32.50
3/21/03	with Atty O'Connor's request on	0.10	32.30
	discovery provisions; draft message		
	to send with draft of Joint		
	Statement requesting his permission to sign for him and file		
3/21/05	Telephone call to client concerning	0.10	No Charge
, 55	.1		. 2220230

May 20, 2005 Edge v. Norfolk Financial Corporation — 04-12134

Hourly Billings for Yvonne W. Rosmarin

Hourly Rate - \$325.00 Travel @ ½ Hourly Rate

Date	Description	Time Spent	Billable
	additional information needed from her for Initial Disclosures left		
	message on voice mail		
3/21/05	Telephone conference with client	0.10	32.50
3/21/03	concerning information needed for	0.10	32.30
	Initial Disclosures		
3/21/05	Finish draft of Initial	0.10	32.50
	Disclosures; proof; make changes		
3/23/05	Prepare for Scheduling Conference	0.30	97.50
3/24/05	Travel to/from court for Scheduling	2.00	325.00
	Conference @ 1/2 hourly rate		
3/24/05	Appear in Court for Scheduling	0.40	130.00
	Conference; make notes		
3/25/05	Draft notes from Scheduling	0.20	65.00
	Conference for file		
4/6/05	Read and assess applicability of	1.00	325.00
	Supreme Court decision in Exxon		
	Mobil case to Defendants' motion to		
4.6.6	dismiss	0 10	
4/6/05	Telephone call to Atty O'Connor	0.10	No Charge
	concerning Supreme Court decision		
	in Exxon Mobil case, intent to submit case as additional		
	authority, whether defendants		
	wish to settle, given new case		
	left message on voice mail		
4/6/05	Draft letter to the Court	0.70	227.50
	submitting additional authority of		
	Supreme Court decision in Exxon		
	Mobil case		
4/7/05	Draft message to Atty O'Connor	0.10	No Charge
	regarding settlement opportunity		
	due to Supreme Court's recent		
	decision in Exxon Mobil case		
4/11/05	Draft letter to Atty O'Connor	0.20	No Charge
	responding to his April 8 letter		
	regarding plaintiff's submission of		
4 / 0 0 / 0 5	additional authority to the Court	0 10	20 50
4/28/05	Telephone conference with Atty	0.10	32.50
	O'Connor concerning his request for assent to motion to supplement the		
	record with documents regarding		
	client's motion to vacate small		
	claims court judgment		
5/2/05	Assess motion for leave to	0.10	32.50
	supplement the record filed by		
	defendants; draft message to Atty		
	O'Connor regarding content of		
	motion and lack of plaintiff's		
	assent to content		
5/3/05	Draft response to defendants'	1.70	552.50

May 20, 2005 Edge v. Norfolk Financial Corporation — 04-12134

Hourly Billings for Yvonne W. Rosmarin

Hourly Rate - \$325.00 Travel @ ½ Hourly Rate

		Time	
Date	Description	Spent	Billable
F / 2 / 2 F	motion to supplement the record	1 20	400 50
5/3/05	Prepare for oral argument on	1.30	422.50
	defendants' motion to dismiss		
	re-read significant cases and		
	memoranda and other filings on motion		
5/3/05	Continue preparation for oral	1.20	390.00
3/3/03	argument on defendants' motion to	1.20	390.00
	dismiss re-read significant		
	cases and memoranda and other		
	filings on motion		
5/4/05	Prepare for oral argument on	0.60	195.00
-, -,	defendants' motion to dismiss -		
	outline plaintiff's argument		
5/4/05	Travel to/from court for oral	1.40	227.50
	argument on defendants' motion to		
	dismiss @ 1/2 hourly rate		
5/4/05	Appear in Court for oral argument	0.30	97.50
	on defendants' motion to dismiss		
5/4/05	Draft notes of court's decision on	0.20	65.00
	defendants' motion to dismiss		
5/6/05	Assess information and documents	1.50	487.50
	needed by way of written discovery		
	requests before defendants'		
F / C / O F	depositions	1 60	F20 00
5/6/05	Draft Plaintiff's first discovery	1.60	520.00
5/9/05	requests to Norfolk Continue draft of plaintiff's first	2.90	942.50
3/9/03	discovery requests to Norfolk;	2.90	942.50
	proof and revise		
5/10/05	Draft Plaintiff's first discovery	0.40	130.00
-,,	requests to defendant Goldstone		
5/10/05	Draft exhibits to deposition notice	0.90	292.50
5/11/05	Continue draft of exhibits to	1.40	455.00
	Norfolk deposition notice		
5/12/05	Assess Defendants' offer of	0.50	162.50
	judgment in light of plaintiff's		
	costs and defendants' strategy		
5/16/05	Telephone conference with client	0.20	65.00
	concerning offer of judgment, what		
	it means, what acceptance and		
	rejection of offer of judgment mean		
5/16/05	Draft plaintiff's acceptance of	0.10	No Charge
F /1 C / O F	defendants' offer of judgment	0.00	65.00
5/16/05	Draft requests to Attorneys John	0.20	65.00
	Roddy and Edwin Smith for declarations in support of		
	plaintiff's fee petition with case		
	information		
5/16/05	Update and revise declaration of	0.50	162.50
2, = 2, 00	Atty Rosmarin for fee petition		• • •
5/16/05	Draft fee petition	0.30	97.50
5/16/05	Research on support for plaintiff's	0.50	162.50

		Time	
Date	Description	Spent	Billable
	fee petition		
5/16/05	Research on cases to support	0.80	260.00
	plaintiff's fee petition		
5/17/05	Assess time sheets; apply billing	1.30	422.50
	judgment; reduce time accordingly		
	and revise		
5/17/05	Draft memorandum in support of	0.80	260.00
	plaintiff's fee petition		
5/17/05	Telephone conference with Atty	0.10	32.50
	Edwin Smith's assistant, Jake		
	Sullivan, concerning logistics for		
	obtaining Smith's declaration in		
	support of plaintiff's fee petition		
5/17/05	Prepare time report for attachment	0.30	97.50
	to fee petition		
5/20/05	Draft portions of plaintiff's	1.00	325.00
	memorandum in support of her fee		
	petition		
5/23/05	Revise portions of memorandum in	0.60	195.00
	support of attorney's fees		
5/25/05	Continue draft of portions of	0.50	162.50
	memorandum in support of fee		
	petition		
5/27/05	Continue draft of memorandum in	0.70	227.50
	support of plaintiff's fee petition		
5/31/05	Revise memorandum in support of	0.20	65.00
	plaintiff's fee petition		
Total		68.90	22197.50
-004-		00.00	<u> </u>

TOTAL Hours - 72.2 Total Billable Hours - 70

66.6 Hrs. @ \$325 / hr. = \$21,645.00

3.4 Hrs. @ \$162.50 / hr. = 552.50

Total Fees = \$22,197.50